

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
FORT SMITH DIVISION

TROY W. HOLLAND, JR.

PLAINTIFF

v.

CIVIL NO. 03-2007

JO ANNE B. BARNHART, Commissioner  
Social Security Administration

DEFENDANT

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Troy W. Holland, Jr., appealed the Commissioner's denial of benefits to this court. On March 15, 2006, judgment was entered remanding plaintiff's case to the Commissioner pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). (Doc. # 17). Plaintiff now moves for an award of \$4,471.06 in attorney's fees and costs under 28 U.S.C. § 2412, the Equal Access to Justice Act (hereinafter "EAJA"), requesting compensation for 30.11 attorney hours work before the court at an hourly rate of \$146.00, 1.50 paralegal hours at an hourly rate of \$50.00 and \$197.50 in expenses. (Doc. # 18-19). The defendant has filed a response, expressing objections to certain hours requested. (Doc. # 20).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(A), the court must award attorney's fees to a prevailing social security claimant unless the Commissioner's position in denying benefits was substantially justified. The burden is on the Commissioner to show substantial justification for the government's denial of benefits. *Jackson v. Bowen*, 807 F.2d 127, 128 (8th Cir. 1986). Under *Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S. 292, 302 (1993), a social security claimant who obtains a sentence-four judgment reversing the Commissioner's denial of benefits and remanding the case

for further proceedings is a prevailing party. After reviewing the record, we find plaintiff is the prevailing party in this matter.

An award of attorney's fees under the EAJA is appropriate even though at the conclusion of the case, plaintiff's attorney may be authorized to charge and collect a fee pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)(1). Recovery of attorney's fees under both the EAJA and 42 U.S.C. § 406(b)(1) was specifically allowed when Congress amended the EAJA in 1985. *Gisbrecht v. Barnhart*, 535 U.S. 789, 796, 122 S.Ct. 1817, 1822, 152 L.Ed.2d 996 (2002), citing Pub.L. 99-80, § 3, 99 Stat. 186 (1985).

To permit a fee award under the EAJA, assuming, of course, that the necessary standard is met, in addition to that allowed by the district court out of a claimant's past-due benefits does no more than reimburse the claimant for his or her expenses and results in no windfall for the attorney.

*Meyers v. Heckler*, 625 F.Supp. 228, 231 (S.D.Ohio 1985). Furthermore, awarding fees under both acts facilitates the purposes of the EAJA, which is to shift to the United States the prevailing party's litigation expenses incurred while contesting unreasonable government action. *Id.* See also, *Cornella v. Schweiker*, 728 F.2d 978 (8th Cir.1984).

In determining a reasonable attorney's fee, the court will in each case consider the following factors: time and labor required; the difficulty of questions involved; the skill required to handle the problems presented; the attorney's experience, ability, and reputation; the benefits resulting to the client from the services; the customary fee for similar services; the contingency or certainty of compensation; the results obtained; and the amount involved. *Allen v. Heckler*, 588 F.Supp. 1247 (W.D.N.Y. 1984).

However, the EAJA is not designed to reimburse without limit. *Pierce v. Underwood*, 487 U.S. 552, 573 (1988). The district court is "in the best position to evaluate counsel's services and fee request, particularly when the court has had the opportunity to observe firsthand counsel's representation on the substantive aspects of the disability claim." *Hickey v. Secretary of HHS*, 923 F.2d 585, 586 (8th Cir.1991), quoting *Cotter v. Bowen*, 879 F.2d 359, 361 (8th Cir.1989). The court can determine the reasonableness and accuracy of a fee request, even in the absence of an objection by the Commissioner. *See Decker v. Sullivan*, 976 F.2d 456, 459 (8th Cir.1992) ("Although the issue was not raised on appeal, fairness to the parties requires an accurately calculated attorney's fee award.").

The EAJA further requires an attorney seeking fees to submit "an itemized statement...stating the actual time expended and the rate at which fees and other expenses were computed." 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(B). Attorneys seeking fees under federal fee-shifting statutes such as the EAJA are required to present fee applications with "contemporaneous time records of hours worked and rates claimed, plus a detailed description of the subject matter of the work." *Id.* Where documentation is inadequate, the court may reduce the award accordingly. *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 433 (1983).

*The Contract with America Advancement Act of 1996*, passed on March 29, 1996, amended the EAJA and increased the statutory ceiling for EAJA fee awards from \$75.00 to \$125.00 per hour. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(2)(A).

Plaintiff requests attorney's fees under the EAJA at a rate of \$146.00 an hour based on an increase in the cost of living. Attorney's fees may not be awarded in excess of \$125.00 per hour - the maximum statutory rate under § 2412(d)(2)(A) - unless the court finds that an increase

in the cost of living or a special factor such as the limited availability of qualified attorneys justifies a higher fee. 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(2)(A). The decision to increase the hourly rate is not automatic and remains at the discretion of the district court. *McNulty v. Sullivan*, 886 F.2d 1074 (8th Cir. 1989). In *Johnson v. Sullivan*, 919 F.2d 503 (8th Cir. 1990), the court stated that the hourly rate may be increased when there is "uncontested proof of an increase in the cost of living sufficient to justify hourly attorney's fees of more than \$75.00 an hour," such as a copy of the Consumer Price Index. Plaintiff's counsel has attached a summary of the Consumer Price Index as an exhibit (Doc. # 21) and has presented evidence of an increase in the cost of living. Therefore, the undersigned believes her argument for enhanced fees based on a cost of living increase has merit. Accordingly, we find that plaintiff's counsel is entitled to an award at the rate of \$146.00 per hour.

We next address the number of hours plaintiff's counsel claims she spent working on this case. Plaintiff's counsel seeks a total of 2.75 hours of work from November 19, 2002, through January 10, 2003. The Complaint was not filed in this court until January 13, 2003.(Doc # 1). We note, time spent at the administrative level is not compensable under the EAJA. *See Cornella v. Schweiker*, 728 F.2d 978, 988-89 (8th Cir. 1984). However, some of the time submitted on the above referenced dates was clearly in preparation for the filing of the Complaint with this court. Therefore, we will allow 1.50 hours. Accordingly, 1.25 hours must be deducted from the total compensable time sought by counsel.

Defendant argues that some of the time submitted should be discounted because this work could have been performed by support staff. *Granville House, Inc. v. Department of HEW*, 813 F.2d 881, 884 (8th Cir.1987) (work which could have been completed by support staff is not

compensable under the EAJA). We find that the work performed on January 14, 2003, June 10, 2003, June 15, 2003, June 22, 2003, July 2, 2003, July 6, 2003, and July 20, 2003, could have been performed by support staff. We further find that the 1.50 paralegal hours submitted on January 22, 2003, and September 8, 2003, could have been performed by support staff. Accordingly, we deduct 0.60 attorney hour and 1.50 paralegal hours from the total number of compensable hours sought.

Plaintiff's counsel seeks 0.15 hour on January 22, 2003 (reviewed and signed service of process), from which we deduct 0.07; 0.15 hour on January 23, 2003 (reviewed order of reference; instructions re computer; then routed to client), from which we deduct 0.07 hour; 0.15 hour on April 2, 2003 (received and reviewed order from magistrate; client), from which we deduct 0.07 hour; 0.25 hour on May 22, 2003 (received and review order of remand; client), from which we deduct 0.17 hour; 0.25 hour March 31, 2005 (order reinstating case dated 3/29/05 by Stites stating missing file been located; updates to file and system, client), from which we deduct 0.17 hour. This court concludes that the time submitted on the above referenced dates, should not have taken an attorney experienced in handling social security cases more than five or six minutes to review these documents. *Bowman v. Secretary of H.H.S.*, 744 F.Supp 898 (E.D.Ark. 1989). Accordingly, 0.55 hour must be deducted from the total compensable time sought by counsel.

Plaintiff's counsel seeks a total of 3.50 hours for corresponding with plaintiff giving him a status report on March 11, 2003, April 23, 2003, November 21, 2003, February 21, 2004, March 10, 2004, June 6, 2003, March 14, 2005, March 14, 2006 (listed as 2005), and March 22, 2006 (listed as 2005). We find this time to be excessive and deduct 1.50 hours from the total

compensable time sought by counsel. We further find the 0.50 hour submitted on March 22, 2006 (listed as 2005), to be excessive and deduct 0.25 hour.

Finally, counsel seeks reimbursement for \$197.50 in expenses incurred with regard to the filing fee, postage and photocopying. Such expenses are recoverable under the EAJA and we find \$197.50 to be a reasonable award. *See Kelly v. Bowen*, 862 F.2d 1333, 1335 (8th Cir. 1988).

Accordingly, we find that counsel is entitled to compensation under the EAJA for: 25.96 (30.11-4.15) hours for attorney's fees, at the rate of \$146.00 per hour, and \$197.50 in expenses for a total attorney's fee award of \$3,987.66. This amount should be paid in addition to, and not out of, any past due benefits which plaintiff may be awarded in the future.

The parties are reminded that the award herein under the EAJA will be taken into account at such time as a reasonable fee is determined pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 406, in order to prevent double recovery by counsel for the plaintiff.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 24<sup>th</sup> day of July 2006.

/s/ Beverly Stites Jones  
HON. BEVERLY STITES JONES  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE